

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **November 3, 2004** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-24. The disclosure was objected to because of informalities. The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Claims 2, 3, 8, 10, 16, 18, and 24 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 2, 10, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 2, 10, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 11, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by Li et al (USPN 6,208,183, hereinafter "Li"). Claims 5, 13, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of Coleman et al (USPN 4,151,473, hereinafter "Coleman"). Claims 6-8, 14-16, 17, 19, 20, and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li.

Objections to the disclosure

The disclosure was objected to because of informalities.

Applicant has amended the disclosure to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. No new matter has been added.

Objections to the drawings

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Specifically, "changing the frequency (speed) of the local chip by changing the power supply voltage must be shown or the feature canceled from the claims."

Applicant respectfully points out that FIG. 1 shows V_{ctl} being coupled to each of the chips forming the oscillator circuit. Paragraph [0027] of the instant application states: "Hence, by varying a common power-supply voltage, V_{ctl} , one can adjust the frequency of the timing signal generated by the oscillator." It is

well-known to persons with ordinary skill in the art that changing the power-supply voltage on this type of oscillator causes a change in operating frequency (see paragraph [0006] of the instant application). Because of these observations, Applicant believes that the drawings conform to 37 CFR 1.83(a) and no corrections are needed for the drawings.

Objections to the claims

Claims 2, 3, 8, 10, 16, 18, and 24 were objected to because of informalities.

Applicant has amended claims 2, 3, 8, 10, 16, 18, and 24 to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Additionally, Applicant has amended claims 17 to correct a typographical error. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Claims 2, 10, and 18 were rejected as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, “The specification and drawings do not describe in any detail how the frequency of the local chip is adjusted by changing the power supply voltage of the local chip.”

Applicant respectfully points out that FIG. 1 shows V_{ctl} being coupled to each of the chips forming the oscillator circuit. Paragraph [0027] of the instant application states: “Hence, by varying a common power-supply voltage, V_{ctl} , one can adjust the frequency of the timing signal generated by the oscillator.” It is well-known to persons with ordinary skill in the art that changing the power-supply voltage on this type of oscillator causes a change in operating frequency (see paragraph [0006] of the instant application). Because of these observations, Applicant believes that claims 2, 10, and 18 comply with the enablement requirement.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Claims 2, 10, and 18 were rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, “These claims are indefinite because they are misdescriptive, i.e., the frequency of the local chip is adjusted using the control signal from the frequency detector and applying to control inputs of the inverters in instant FIG. 1, not by changing the power supply voltage of the chip.”

Applicant respectfully points out that the control signal is the power supply voltage. Paragraph [0027] of the instant application states: “Hence, by varying a common power-supply voltage, V_{ctl} , one can adjust the frequency of the timing signal generated by the oscillator.” It is well-known to persons with ordinary skill in the art that changing the power-supply voltage on this type of oscillator causes a change in operating frequency (see paragraph [0006] of the instant application). Because of these observations, Applicant believes that claims 2, 10, and 18 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1 and 9 were rejected as being anticipated by Li. Independent claim 17 was rejected as being unpatentable over Li. Applicant respectfully points out that Li teaches controlling the output frequency of a clock circuit by using a **voltage controlled delay line** (see Li, FIG. 3, references 220 and 222, and col. 7, lines 58-63).

In contrast, the present invention controls the speed of a chip by **changing the power supply voltage** applied to the chip (see paragraph [0027] of the instant application). Changing the power supply voltage applied to the chip to change the speed of the chip is beneficial because it minimizes the circuitry required to control the speed of the chip. There is nothing within Li, either explicit or

implicit, which suggests controlling the speed of a chip by changing the power supply voltage applied to the chip.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to include limitations from dependent claims 2, 10, and 18, respectively, to clarify that the present invention controls the speed of a chip by changing the power supply voltage applied to the chip. These amendments find support in FIG. 1, and in paragraph [0027] of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, and 17 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-8, which depend upon claim 1, claims 11-16, which depend upon claim 9, and claims 19-24, which depend upon claim 17, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: January 4, 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665